

As from
this hour
You use your
power,
The World
must follow
you

THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZER

Stand all as
one
Till right
is done!
Believe and
dare and do!

SAN FRANCISCO BRANCH
CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
1179 Market Street - Room 402
MEETINGS 1st & 3rd SUNDAYS 7 P.M.

Official Organ of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union Local 544-CIO
MINNEAPOLIS OFFICE: 9TH ST. AND 12TH AVE. S.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1941

FIVE CENTS

Prosecution Shows Anti-Labor Bias in Trial

Miners End Strike Under Army Threat

Captive Coal Mine Strikers End One-Week Strike Monday; Agree to Arbitrate Their Demand for Union Shop Through Three-Man Board Composed of Lewis, Steelman, Fairless

After their one-week strike, during which the "captive" coal miners felt the full weight of the employing class and the government, the 53,000 captive miners and the 200,000 commercial miners who came out in sympathy with the strike against the Steel barons, members called off their strike last week-end and accepted a White House proposal for arbitration of the union shop issue by a special three-man board.

The Policy Committee of the United Mine Workers, meeting Sunday afternoon, accepted the proposal to end the strike, and directed strikers to return to work Monday morning.

Despite continuous threats from President Roosevelt to call out the Army against the strike, and to unleash a wave of anti-labor legislation in Congress, the UMW stood firm throughout the week in defense of the union shop, the issue over which the strike was fought. Several proposals from Roosevelt to end the strike were rejected by the militant miners and their president, John L. Lewis.

Not until Saturday morning did the President make a proposal which the union Policy Committee found it possible to accept. In his last of many open letters to Lewis, Roosevelt for the first time proposed three specific names as members of the three-man arbitration board: John L. Lewis, Benjamin Fairless (President of U. S. Steel Corporation), and as the third man, John R. Steelman, director of the United States Conciliation Service. Steelman, as conciliator, supported the union shop for the soft coal miners in the controversy of 1938.

Under the given circumstances—the state of the union movement, and the reactionary political atmosphere, Roosevelt's preparation to call out the army to break the strike, the treachery of the AFL top leaders in denouncing the strike and voting against the miners' demand in the National Defense Mediation Board, the all-out support of the profiteering Steel Trust by the national administration—it must be said that the United Mine Workers were justified in calling off the strike and submitting to arbitration before a three-man board of the character finally specified by Roosevelt.

Lewis Denounces Mediation Board

In announcing the action of the union Policy Committee, Lewis

In Mine Dispute Steel Companies Won't Abide by Board Decision

Following reports from Republic Steel and National Steel that they would not abide by the decision of the three-man board arbitrating the captive coal mine dispute, negotiations halted Thursday while Chairman John Steelman wired the nine steel corporations to clarify their position.

Action of the steel firms comes as a surprise only to those who failed to see that Roosevelt directed all his pressure against the United Mine Workers throughout the fight, and misdirected the public's attention from the stubborn refusal of the Steel Trust to grant the justifiable demand of the miners for a union shop.

At press time it is not known whether the steel companies will alter their stand. Should they refuse, the miners will be forced to re-strike the captive mines.

Roosevelt daily threatened the strikers with 50,000 soldiers—"equipped with pistols, rifles, sub-machine guns and possibly some bombs," as the N. Y. Times for November 20th made clear.

Daily he threatened the CIO with anti-labor legislation. And after the strike was over, on Monday, he was reported as urging Congress to pass anti-labor legislation.

Efforts of the President and his followers to continue masquerading as "friends of labor" are mighty thread-bare indeed, though they are still being made. Last week, for instance, a "White House adviser" reported Roosevelt was holding back the Army "because he is a friend of the working man and does not want to do anything to destroy the working man's confidence."

Miners Not Fooled
That such hypocrisy did not fool the miners was indicated even in the reports of the boss press. "Some of the men down here didn't care no more for Mr. Roosevelt than they did for scabs," the N. Y. TIMES for October 24th reported miners in Pennsylvania as stating.

Earlier Proposals Rejected
Before accepting the White House proposal to end the strike, the union Policy Committee had rejected several earlier proposals.

For instance, on Wednesday, November 19th, Roosevelt wrote the union proposing the strike be ended on the basis of an open shop status for the "emergency," with the alternative of submitting the union shop issue to arbitration before an unnamed board.

To this proposal, Lewis replied in part that "Even if the Mine Workers' representatives possessed the authority to leave the question of the union shop to the arbitration of an umpire, it is obvious that a judicial decision based upon the logic and merit of our contention would be difficult, under existing circumstances. YOUR REPRESENTATIVES ARE NOT INTERESTED IN SUCH A COURSE."

For Defense Against Fascists
Dan Doyle—For many years driver at DeLattre-Dixon. Joined old Local 574 back in 1934. Joined UDG in August, 1938. Told of reading in daily papers of threatened Silver Shirt attacks upon Local 544. Attended 7 or 8 meetings of UDG, heard Farrel Dobbs and V. R. Dunne speak, explaining

the UDG was formed to protect the union and union headquarters against fascist attacks.

Ole Reiersen—Cement block worker, joined 544 in 1936; since June, 1941, has been member of Cement Finishers Local 557. Joined Union Defense Guard in fall of 1938; heard V. R. Dunne and Ray Rainbolt speak on need of guard to defend union against Silver Shirts. Read that Silver Shirts were meeting at Royal Arcanum hall, that George K. Belen, head of labor-hating Associated Industries, was attending fascist meetings. After UDG formed, Silver Shirts lost their enthusiasm to raid Local 544 headquarters.

Union Stewards Testify
Harold Martin—Works at New England Furniture. Joined 544 in April, 1936; was job steward. Remembers hearing Ray Rainbolt tell UDG meeting that purpose of guard was to defend union against anti-labor groups, and to usher at union picnics and union Christmas parties for children.

The UDG stopped meeting early in 1939, after Silver Shirts disappeared.

Dick Atherton—Driver at Briest-Richter for 12 years. Joined 574 in May, 1934; job steward; leader of 544's orchestra. Joined UDG when formed. Heard short talks about need of guard to defend union headquarters against Silver Shirt raids. Union orchestra played for Turkey Round-up given by UDG.

Captain in Defense Guard
Gustave Reiersen—Joined 544 in spring of 1936; in June, 1941, transferred to Cement Finishers Local 557. Cement-block maker at Hedberg. Freidheim's since 1932. Captain in UDG, attended 6-8 meetings. "We felt our union

Roy Orgon



"The defendants are the most honest trade union leaders I have ever known," Roy Orgon told the court Monday afternoon.

Miles Dunne



The President of Local 544-CIO told of his work and his experiences in the Minneapolis labor movement.

Ray Rainbolt



The chairman of the Union Defense Guard told the court why Local 544 organized the guard to defend itself against fascist attacks.

544 Defense Witnesses Are Contrast to Tobin Thugs

Twelve Members of Local 544 Take Stand for Defense; Their Appearance and Testimony Impress Observers

Among the witnesses to take the stand for the defense in the "sedition" trial were twelve members of Local 544, five of them defendants. In sharpest contrast to the Tobin-paid riff-raff who testified for the prosecution, the dozen 544 defense witnesses were the finest type of union men—clean-cut, alert, honest, stable workers, the kind whose efforts and sacrifices in the interests of labor have made Minneapolis a union town.

All union men to testify for the defense have long and honorable records in the labor movement; all are known and respected on the job, as good workers and good union men.

By their testimony they cut to ribbons the perjured story told by the Tobin agents that the Union Defense Guard was organized to overthrow the United States government.

In the order of their appearance, these are the 544 members who testified for the defense:

Kenneth McKenzie—Long-time driver for Socony-Vacuum. Joined 544 in July, 1936. Joined Union Defense Guard in 1938, to defend union and union hall against Silver Shirts. Attended UDG meetings, but never heard anyone ever say the UDG was organized to overthrow the government.

Dan Doyle—For many years driver at DeLattre-Dixon. Joined old Local 574 back in 1934. Joined UDG in August, 1938. Told of reading in daily papers of threatened Silver Shirt attacks upon Local 544. Attended 7 or 8 meetings of UDG, heard Farrel Dobbs and V. R. Dunne speak, explaining

was in danger from the Silver Shirts.

Vincent Dunne—Pioneer organizer of Drivers Union. Testimony related elsewhere in this issue.

George Froisig—Oldest official of Drivers Union. Vice-president of 544-CIO. One of defendants freed for lack of evidence. Testified that 544 board and staff and committees often met at Nicollet hotel.

Best Leaders He Ever Met

Roy Orgon—Former organizer of 544's Federal Workers Section. Driver at Mun Hing's until driven off job last June by 50 Tobin goons. Testified has not been member of Trotskyist group since 1937, but believes they are "the most honest union leaders I have ever met."

Ray Rainbolt—Organizer and recording secretary, 544-CIO. Testified on Union Defense Guard activities, was elected chairman of guard.

Miles Dunne—President of 544-CIO, former secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Joint Council up to June, 1941. Testified never member of Socialist Workers Party, but sympathetic to their ideas; has believed in socialism since childhood.

Farrel Dobbs—Former secretary-treasurer Local 574 and 544; former International organizer for AFL Teamsters. Testimony related elsewhere.

Slanders 544 1934 Strikes

Prosecution Says WPA Workers Had No Right to Organize; Tries to Stir Anti-Labor Feeling in Jury

Prosecution cross-questioning of Local 544-CIO witnesses for the defense, and U. S. District Attorney Anderson's final argument, this week revealed the anti-labor bias of the prosecution more crudely than ever before during the "sedition" trial of 23 members of Local 544-CIO and of the Socialist Workers Party.

In his final argument Anderson repeated all the Associated Industries' slanders as he reviewed the activities of each of the 23 defendants in the labor movement, and sought to arouse every anti-labor prejudice that might exist among the jurors.

In asking the conviction of Ed Palmquist and Roy Orgon, leaders of Local 544's Federal Workers Section, Anderson went so far as to deny that WPA workers have a right to organize. "Why did WPA workers need a union? The government takes care of WPA," ranted Anderson, and concluded that "the only purpose of the Federal Workers Section was to seize power, to take over Minneapolis."

At another point Anderson spoke so viciously against strikes that the defense had to ask Judge Joyce to instruct

the jury that the right to strike still exists. In this "national emergency," Anderson had told the jury, the jurors "could find" that the defendants had fomented strikes for "unreasonable demands" and such strikes, if the jurors found the demands unreasonable, were "part of the seditious conspiracy."

A request by defense counsel to the judge to strike out this viciously anti-labor statement of Anderson was refused.

Anderson's associate in the prosecution, Assistant U. S. Attorney-General Schweinhaut, expressly sent from Washington to supervise the case, was no less hostile to labor.

In cross-questioning defendant and defense witness Farrel Dobbs, formerly secretary-treasurer of Local 544 and later International Organizer of the teamsters, Schweinhaut charged that Dobbs and the other defendants were constantly fomenting unnecessary strikes by instructing their followers never to accept arbitration in labor disputes.

Dobbs Spikes Schweinhaut
In this encounter Schweinhaut came off second-best, for Dobbs testified as an expert in this field, having negotiated and signed hundreds of union contracts. Dobbs was spokesman for the 11-state Area Committee which signed con-

tracts covering more than 250,000 over-the-road drivers and 800 employees.

Dobbs explained that the defendants' trade union policy favored direct negotiations between unions and employers as the most favorable method of winning gains for the workers. At times, however, Dobbs explained, it was necessary and permissible for unions to arbitrate certain issues.

As an example, Dobbs cited to the court the case of the present United Mine Workers dispute over the closed shop in the captive mines. Due to Roosevelt's threat to use the army against the coal miners, and the attempts of Congressmen to push through repressive legislation against strikers, (Continued on page 4)

Read Goldman's Summary for the Defense Next Week

As we go to press today, Friday, Defense Attorney Goldman, himself a defendant, is in the midst of his summation speech in the "sedition" trial. Observers say that his speech is one of the greatest ever heard in a labor trial. We will print sections of it in next week's Industrial Organizer. Don't miss it.

CIO CONVENTION DENOUNCES OPM; PLEDGES UCWOC SUPPORT

The CIO national convention, which concluded its session last week in Detroit, included among its more important activities the overwhelming approval of a resolution denouncing the Office of Production Management, of which Sidney Hillman is co-director, and a sweeping endorsement of the CIO United Construction Workers Organizing Committee.

Though considered a compromise resolution by the UCWOC, which had demanded the inclusion in it of a call for the ouster of traitor Hillman from his post in the OPM, the resolution was nevertheless seen as a stiff blow to Hillman and the anti-labor OPM.

Text of Resolution

Excerpts from the resolution follow: "WHEREAS (1) The United Construction Workers Organizing Committee has been duly chartered by the Congress of Industrial Organization, and thereby constitutes an affiliate organization of the CIO entitled to all the rights,

privileges and cooperation extended to all CIO affiliated organizations; and

"(2) The UCWOC as an affiliate organization of the CIO is entitled to receive the whole-hearted and organized cooperation and support from every affiliated organization and member of the CIO; and

"(3) The consummation of the so-called stabilization agreement between the OPM and its officials and the Building Trades Department of the AFL is an indefensible act in that it provides an actual monopoly upon all government construction work to the building trade unions of the AFL and excludes every member of the CIO from being employed upon any national defense construction job; and

OPM Fights CIO

"(4) The vicious abuse of authority and extra-legal procedure of the OPM and its officials in executing the so-called stabilization agreement for the construction industry with the Building Trades Department of the AFL was eloquently demonstrated in the denial by the OPM of a government contract to the Carrier Lumber company, the low responsible bidder on the Wayne County (Mich.) housing project, for the sole reason that this company had entered into a collective bargain-

ing arrangement with the UCWOC, and this constitutes a vicious example of illegal discrimination against the UCWOC upon the part of the officials of the OPM; and

"(5) If this action of the OPM is permitted to stand unchallenged, a dangerous precedent will have been established which will have havoc not only upon the UCWOC but upon every affiliated organization of the CIO, and will constitute a vicious act of discrimination by government against the CIO as contrasted with other segments of labor; and will, in effect, nullify the principles set forth in the National Labor Relations Act, which permits the right of free choice of bargaining representation to all workers, now, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED: (1) That this convention denounces the action of the OPM and its officials in entering into an agreement with the Building Trades Department of the AFL, which agreement effectively prohibits members of the UCWOC from obtaining work on national defense construction; and that this convention denounces the OPM and its responsible officials for their reprehensible and extra-legal act in denying to the Carrier Lumber company the award of a contract for 300 defense houses in Wayne County, to be occupied by members of the CIO.

"(2) That this convention directs its national officers to make forthright representation immediately and continuously to the responsible officials of the OPM and to the President of the United States demanding that the discriminatory stabilization agreement be nullified in its entirety; and

"(3) THAT IT IS THE DESIRE AND INSTRUCTION OF THIS CONVENTION TO ALL MEMBERS AND ALL AFFILIATED BODIES OF THE CIO THAT THEY EXTEND TO THE UCWOC THEIR WHOLEHEARTED, SINCERE AND ORGANIZED SUPPORT IN ITS EFFORT TO BRING CLEAN INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM TO THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY; AND THAT THIS CONVENTION BELIEVES THAT A SUCCESSFUL ORGANIZING CAMPAIGN BY THE UCWOC WILL PROVE BENEFICIAL TO EVERY AFFILIATED ORGANIZATION OF THE CIO AND WILL PROVIDE HOMES FOR CIO MEMBERS AT A COST WHICH THEY CAN AFFORD TO PAY; AND WILL RELIEVE OBSTRUCTION TO THE ORGANIZATION DRIVE OF ALL AFFILIATED UNIONS; AND WILL GREATLY ASSIST IN ACCOMPLISHING THE GOAL OF THE CIO AS ENUNCIATED BY THE SLOGAN: 'TEN MILLION MEMBERS BY 1945.'"

Brewery Drivers Here Are Victimized by Tobin Goons

After forcing the Brewery Workers International Union out of the American Federation of Labor, Dictator Tobin this week ordered his Minneapolis agents to fire the opening gun in a nation-wide campaign to raid the Brewery Workers of their beer drivers and warehousemen.

The Minneapolis war, launched Wednesday after several weeks of preparation, brings to a new stage Tobin's thirty-year-old reactionary campaign to raid this industrial union, one of the oldest in the American trade union movement.

In a democratically conducted meeting of their union Wednesday night at the Eagle hall, the brewery drivers voted overwhelmingly—447 to 35—to remain with the Brewery Workers Union.

Tobinism Vs. Democracy
The very next day the Tobin goons, contemptuous of the democratic decision of the brewery drivers, took to the streets to resume their reactionary campaign against these men.

The threat was clearly implied by the presence of the Tobin goons that resistance on the part of the brewery drivers would draw down on their heads the same violence dealt out to the members of Local 544 last summer when they attempted to exercise their democratic rights to leave the AFL and join the CIO.

The Rank Partiality to Tobin Shown by Stassen's Labor Conciliator in the 544 Controversy Made It Plain in Advance to the

representative William Delwaide, that it will resist the Tobin raids in every way possible, and the union appeals to all honest trade unionists for support.

When Honest Men Led Drivers

For the past seven years, up to last summer, a powerful, honest and militant drivers' union existed in Minneapolis. All during these years, relations between Local 544 and the Brewery Workers Union were of the friendliest nature. Local 544 supported the Brewery Workers and refused to carry out Tobin's reactionary instructions to raid their union.

During the fight of Local 544-CIO against Tobin, prior to the Stassen-Blair certification of the Tobin union, we warned the labor movement that if Tobin succeeded in installing his dictatorship, raids on other unions would immediately ensue. Now Tobin confirms this prediction by his assault on the Brewery Workers. Other raids will follow, in the program of this power-hungry bureaucrat.

A Pledge from 544-CIO

Local 544-CIO has not given up the fight against Tobin. As a matter of fact, 544-CIO will ultimately win that fight. And when the drivers of Minneapolis win their victory over Tobin, the Brewery Workers may be assured that 544-CIO will not raid their union, but instead will help them preserve and protect their fine industrial organization.

V. R. Dunne Defends Record of Local 544-CIO

Pioneer Unionist On Witness Stand

Defends Historic Achievements of 1934 Drivers' Strikes Against Slanderous Prosecution Attack

The vicious slanders of the prosecution in the "sedition" trial against Local 544 and its leadership made it necessary for the defense to review briefly the glorious history of the rise and growth of the union. Defendant V. R. Dunne, Local 544-CIO organizer, was the main defense witness through whom the story of the union was developed. We reprint below, from the official court record, excerpts from Ray Dunne's testimony. Note the prosecution's fear of the witness, telling the story of how Tobin refused to abide by the democratic decisions of the truck drivers:

VINCENT R. DUNNE

was called as a witness on behalf of the Defendants, and having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

Q: How long have you been living in Minneapolis?

A: A little more than thirty years.

Q: And where did you live before that?

A: My home before coming to Minneapolis was at Little Falls, Minnesota.

Q: Where were you born, Mr. Dunne?

A: In Kansas City, Kansas.

Q: How old are you?

A: Fifty-two.

Q: What is your occupation at the present?

A: I am an organizer for Local 544-CIO.

Q: And how long have you been at your present occupation?

A: Since the early days of the organization of the Drivers Union in 1934.

Q: How long have you been working for the CIO?

A: Since June 9th, this year.

Q: And what were you doing before that?

A: Organizer for the Drivers' Union, AFL-544.

Q: When did you become such an organizer?

A: In 1937, that is, as an official paid organizer.

Q: And were you ever an unpaid organizer?

A: Unpaid organizer, yes, for several years before that.

Q: What did you do for a living before you became an official paid organizer?

A: I worked at various jobs that I could get, including some of the governmental made-work jobs.

Q: When did you first start organizing the Truck Drivers here in Minneapolis?

A: In 1934.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.

Q: When did you work in a coal yard?

A: I worked for the DeLaitre-Dixon Coal Company from 1918 until 1931—thirteen years.

Q: And what were you doing while you were working in the coal yard?

A: Well, over a period of thirteen years I did all the work that is associated with the retail delivery of coal and fuel generally—that is, I drove a team, drove a truck, shoveled in the yard, ran an elevator, general work around the coal yard, and later became a weigh master, weighing out coal.

Q: Did you work in any coal yard?

A: Yes.



Vincent R. Dunne

Q: When was the next strike?

A: The next strike occurred in May, 1934.

Q: What negotiations, if any, were attempted to prevent that strike?

A: A long, long series of negotiations were held, or rather, attempts at negotiations, I should say, which took on very much the same form as the negotiations that were attempted in the coal strike—virtual refusal of the employers to agree that the union represented the men.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: A mass meeting of the strikers themselves voted calling the strike.

Q: And which ones of the defendants, do you remember, participated in that strike?

A: Practically all the men here from 544 and other defendants, such as Oscar Coover—the active trade unionists in general helped in the strike.

Q: How long did the strike last?

A: About ten or eleven days, I believe.

Q: And was there a settlement reached after that?

A: Yes, a settlement was reached with the employers. That is, not a contract signed—it was a project, one might say, for a contract, an agreement to end the strike, grant union recognition, grant the right to represent the men, and with a small advance in wages. That is, we would call it small now—but it was really a big advance for the men at that time as the wages were very low at that period; but the agreement was not a hard and fast contract, such as we know union contracts today.

Q: There was no formal contract then?

A: It was a stipulation; that is the correct term, I think.

Q: What was the next strike that the union called?

A: The next strike was called in July of that same year—1934.

Q: And what attempts, if any, were made to prevent that strike?

A: Well, we put in almost a solid month of attempts at negotiation. The employers had broken their agreement on the stipulation. That was the cause for the July strike. The employers had reneged on their agreement and tried to exclude from the benefits of the union, the men on the market, the warehousemen. In other words, the employers attempted to set up the jurisdiction limits of the union and attempted to exclude from the benefits of the agreement that had been reached, those men who worked inside the warehouses and particularly a thousand to fifteen hundred were affected by that.

Q: Did the union attempt to settle these differences?

A: We attempted to get the employers to agree that the stipulation arrived at in May actually covered these men, but without avail.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The members of the union.

Q: How long did the strike last?

A: More than a month.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And how long did the strike last?

A: Three days, as I recall.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result of the strike was a victory for the union; we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And how long did the strike last?

A: Three days, as I recall.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result of the strike was a victory for the union; we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And how long did the strike last?

A: Three days, as I recall.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result of the strike was a victory for the union; we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And how long did the strike last?

A: Three days, as I recall.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result of the strike was a victory for the union; we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And how long did the strike last?

A: Three days, as I recall.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result of the strike was a victory for the union; we received the agreement of the employers that they would grant us the right to hold an election to determine whether or not the union represented the men. We accepted that.

Q: And what happened after that?

A: A strike was called.

Q: Who authorized the calling of the strike?

A: The men who worked in the yards.

Q: And what was the result?

A: The result was victory of the union. We established our right to represent the men on the market, the men in the warehouses who came under our jurisdiction. The result was again a compromise as far as wages and conditions were concerned, but we actually came to a better agreement, a more finished form of agreement with the employers.

Q: Who of the defendants were with you in the leadership of those strikes?

A: Well, practically all of the men that are here on trial now, were active.

Q: What was the number of the Local under whose auspices all these strikes were called?

A: Local 574, AFL.

Q: And was that part of any International?

A: That was part of the Teamsters International, so-called.

Q: Did anything occur subsequent to the July strike which took 574 out of the International?

A: Yes. During the period just following the strikes of 1934, Local 574 was expelled from the Teamsters International by President Tobin.

Q: Tobin expelled us on the pretext that the per capita tax had not been paid. The union was, of course, bankrupt after the strikes. We recognized the obligation to pay per capita tax when we could afford it, but President Tobin was absolutely impatient and expelled the union from the International.

Q: How long did you remain out of the AFL?

A: From the spring of 1935 until August, 1936.

Q: Tobin Fails to Wreck Union

A: In the spring of 1936, Tobin sent in a group to set up a dual drivers movement. He sent in a bunch of tough pug uglies to clean us out, to smash the union, to set up a new union. That was the form that Mr. Tobin's opposition took to our existence as a union.

Q: And what was the final outcome?

A: The final outcome was a failure on the part of Mr. Tobin to wreck the union.

Q: He finally made proposals to Local 574 to come back into the Teamsters International. He had previously stated that we would never be allowed back in the International.

Q: So that peace was made between the Local and the International?

A: Yes, we entered into an agreement with the International Union and its officials, an agreement that brought the union back into the International on its former basis, with the number 544, and we, as we had offered to do before we were expelled, resumed responsibility for per capita tax payments and for living up to the laws of the International. Mr. Tobin made an attempt to saddle upon us in semi-form of dictatorship, even in this agreement that we made.

Q: And did you become an officer, at that time, of Local 544?

A: No, I was not an officer. That is, we made that as a concession to Mr. Tobin, so we had peace.

Q: It was part of the agreement that you should not be an executive board member.

A: That is correct.

Q: Now, when were you first appointed as Organizer in 544?

A: In 1937, early 1937, as I recall.

Q: Strong Union Keeps Peace

Q: Now, after the July Strike of '34, what strikes, if any, did the union conduct?

A: Only a very few strikes occurred from the big strikes of '34 until the present day.

Q: At no time was there any widespread strike that encompassed the entire union.

A: The two strikes that could be called serious strikes were strikes against the wholesale grocery employers, in 1936 and 1937. Other than that, there have been comparatively few strikes.

Q: And since 1937 have there been any strikes?

A: No.

Q: A Correction

Last week's INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZER listed on page 3 the names of the score of Tobin payrollers and stooges who have testified for the prosecution against the defendants in the "sedition" trial.

Through an error the name of John J. Kenney was erroneously included in the dishonor roll of Tobin agents.

Brother Kenney has never been on the Tobin payroll; has never been a Tobin supporter nor a member of the Tobin "Committee of 99"; and is not the brother-in-law of Sidney Brennan. All that Brother Kenney, when subpoenaed as a government witness, testified to on the stand was his membership in the Union Defense Guard.

Brother Kenney has written in asking a correction of our error; this correction we are glad to make, with apologies to him.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM PROTESTS TRIAL

A resolution sharply condemning the Department of Justice for its prosecution of the 23 CIO unionists and leaders of the Socialist Workers Party now on trial in Minneapolis was unanimously adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Minnesota Branch, at its state-wide meeting in St. Paul on November 12.

Particularly significant is the fact that this famous women's organization took this action immediately after hearing an eyewitness report on the trial from a leading member of the organization. (This observer had heard, by that time, the entire three-week presentation of the prosecution's case.) Thus the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom takes its stand along with the American Civil Liberties Union, the Workers Defense League, the Union for Democratic Action, the General Defense Committee, liberal and labor organizations which have protested against the federal government's attack on the Bill of Rights.

The resolution, which the Women's International League sent to Attorney General Biddle, states:

"We deplore the action taken by the Federal Department of Justice in the prosecution of members of the Socialist Workers Party now under indictment in Minneapolis. To all intents and purposes this trial has become a prosecution for holding and advocating opinions about government, an unprecedented trial of a legally constituted political party.

"We maintain unreservedly the right of the defendants to hold and advocate their opinions. Such right is guaranteed to all citizens of the United States in the first amendment to the Constitution under the Bill of Rights—the right of free speech.

"It behooves our Government, in this hour of crisis for democracy in the world, to strike a fatal blow at the very roots of democracy in our own land."

There was there any opposition to the defendants who were running for office since 1937 or '38?

A: There has been opposition to the leadership of the Local in practically all elections. That is, men nominated from the floor have run for office in the elections against the leadership of the union.

Q: Did any opposition ever claim fraud in the elections?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: Is that material, Mr. Goldman?

MR. GOLDMAN: I think so. After all, one of the issues in the case is the so-called control of the union.

THE WITNESS: I have never personally heard anyone, except one or two men, make that charge.

Q: When was the last election held in 544 prior to the secession from the AFL?

A: In January, 1941.

Q: Were there any opposition candidates then?

A: Yes, yes, there were—candidates for every post, if I recall it.

Q: How was the decision to secede from the AFL arrived at?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: He may answer.

THE WITNESS: The decision was made by the members of the union.

Q: How many members were present at that meeting at which this decision was made?

A: I haven't any exact count, but my best estimate would be between 2,800 and 3,000 men.

Q: Do you recollect as to how many voted for secession and how many against?

MR. SCHWEINHART: I object to that as immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: I don't think that is material.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, your Honor, I think that it is also important to give the jury an understanding that this so-called secession was voted upon by the men, and that the overwhelming majority favored it.

THE COURT: Well, he has already testified as to the number who voted. It is to be assumed, I suppose, that the majority voted in favor of it or it wouldn't have occurred.

MR. GOLDMAN: Very well.

MR. SCHWEINHART: Furthermore, we haven't attempted to establish that they didn't have elections in 544.

MR. GOLDMAN: I sat through three weeks here and I got the impression that the prosecution claimed that somehow or other the Socialist Workers Party was organized in some way to control the union, not through elections, but that they would put men into control of the unions and thus create a conspiracy. That is the impression that I got from the prosecution and I want to show to the jury that all of the officers in the union were elected, and that all the things done there were by vote of the men.

THE COURT: Well, go ahead.

Q: (By Mr. Goldman) Did you personally participate in asking for democratic elections after the secession?

MR. ANDERSON: I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: This is when, now?

MR. ANDERSON: After the secession.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is, after the disaffiliation with the AFL; I am asking him whether he personally knows anything about the attempt to get elections and the opposition of the AFL to these elections.

Q: And to your best recollection,

Industrial Organizer

Published every Thursday under the auspices of
Local 544, CIO

Office of Publication, 9th St. and 12th Ave. S.

One year in advance.....\$2.00
Six months in advance.....\$1.00
Single copies (12 copy minimum).....25¢

Entered as second-class matter July 17, 1941, at the post
office at Minneapolis, Minnesota, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Business Manager DANIEL BURKE Editor MILES B. DUNNE

Roosevelt's Latest Move

As reported in detail in this issue's National Picket Line, President Roosevelt has approved the drastic anti-labor bill drawn up by the House Labor Committee, and has instructed Representative Ramspeck to report the bill in the House.

As was to be inferred from Roosevelt's recent actions against labor, all the provisions of the White House bill are directed against labor. There is nothing in the bill to penalize management in the slightest degree.

In a word, Roosevelt's "solution" to the labor situation is to force compulsory arbitration upon unions, to rob them of their right to strike, and to tear to shreds all the legislative rights won by labor in previous years.

Should any union refuse to submit its demands to compulsory arbitration, that union would lose all its rights, not only under the National Labor Relations Act, but under the Anti-Injunction and Unemployment Compensation Laws as well.

No penalties against the corporations are included in the bill. In an effort to justify this lack, Roosevelt and Attorney-General Biddle explain that the government has powers under the Selective Service Act to seize any plant where the management fails to comply with compulsory arbitration.

THE JOKER IS THAT EVEN IF THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD "SEIZE" A PLANT, THE PLANT OWNERS KNOW THAT SUCH SEIZURE WILL NOT PENALIZE THEM IN THE LEAST OR HALT THEIR PROFITS. FOR THEY WOULD BE COMPENSATED IN FULL BY THE GOVERNMENT.

From beginning to end, the Roosevelt bill is aimed ONLY at labor, is directed ONLY against labor, is DESIGNED only to weaken labor's position.

Were labor forced to forego its right to strike, the workers would have no means of utilizing their economic strength to enforce their demands. All the boss has to do is to stand pat, provoke the union into action, call upon Roosevelt to strip the union of all its legal rights, cut the union to ribbons, and bring back the Open Shop in industry.

University of Chicago Group Supports Defense

Protests FBI Attempt to Suppress Civil Liberties of Defendants — Endorses Civil Rights Defense Committee Work

The University of Chicago COMMITTEE TO FIGHT DOMESTIC FASCISM last week adopted a resolution protesting efforts of the FBI and the federal prosecutors to deprive the "sedition" defendants of their civil liberties. The university committee endorsed the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee and pledged itself to "do all at our command to avert this and similar miscarriages of justice."

The text of the resolution adopted by the Committee to Fight Domestic Fascism follows:

WHEREAS: The University of Chicago Committee to Fight Domestic Fascism views civil liberties as a cherished aspect of our present society, particularly for labor organizations, students, and minority political parties; and

WHEREAS: twenty-nine members of Minneapolis Local 544-CIO, Motor Transport Workers Union and/or members of the Socialist Workers Party, were indicted by a Federal Grand Jury in St. Paul, Minnesota, on July 15, 1941, under charge of violation of the Sedition Act of 1863 and the Smith Act of 1940; and

WHEREAS: this charge consists, not in attempting an overt act against the government, but merely in maintaining a belief in the propriety of changing the governmental system of the United States of America; and

WHEREAS: The American Civil Liberties Union and National Executive Board of the Workers Defense League, two of the countries' outstanding civil liberties organizations, have also condemned the government's prosecution as a serious threat to civil liberties; and

WHEREAS: the leaders of the Minneapolis Local 544-CIO Motor Transport Workers Union have been welcomed into the Congress of Industrial Organizations by President Philip Murray and other national officers, and the case of the twenty-nine has been unanimously endorsed by the United Automobile Workers' National Convention at Buffalo, New York;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The University of Chicago Committee to Fight Domestic Fascism protests the attempt of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the attempt of the federal prosecutors to deprive these twenty-nine defendants of their right to join the labor union of their choice and of their right to hold an independent political opinion, and we condemn the use of governmental agencies in such activity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That we call upon the Department of Justice to dismiss the case against these twenty-nine defendants; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the University of Chicago Committee to Fight Domestic Fascism endorses the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee, the authorized representative of the defendants, and we will do all at our command to avert this and similar miscarriages of justice; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the campus and to the daily press, to the National Office of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, to Minneapolis Local 544-CIO, Motor Transport Workers Union, to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, to President Daniel J. Tobin of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and to Attorney General Francis J. Biddle.

Unanimously adopted on November 17, 1941.

(Signed) MURRAY L. WAX

On the National Picket Line

Marcel Schell

President Roosevelt has given the "green light" to the proponents of anti-labor legislation. It seems that our magnanimous president has restrained himself as long as he could, but now that he is convinced that labor will not "behave itself" he has decided to remove his "disapproval" to such legislation, and let nature take its course.

And "Nature" in this case takes the form of Poll-tax Representative Ramspeck from Georgia. Ramspeck's bill will be reported on the floor of the House Friday, November 26. It is expected that the bill will be rushed through the legislative gin-mill as fast as possible in order to satisfy the President that "there will be no recurrence of what happened last week." (The Miners' Strike.)

The Ramspeck Bill, for down-right viciousness, exceeds any previous piece of legislation yet attempted. It embodies four principles. They are—

- (1) Mandatory negotiations between management and workers.
- (2) Conciliation by the Department of Labor.
- (3) Mediation by a statutory board EMPOWERED TO PROHIBIT STRIKES DURING THE MEDIATION PERIOD.
- (4) COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

The provisions of the bill setting up both a board with power to enforce its services and compulsory arbitration, are supplemented by stringent penalties AGAINST LABOR if any union violates the tenets of the Act. They are—

"For labor, loss of rights under existing laws, particularly the National Labor Relations, the Anti-Injunction and Unemployment Compensation Laws."

The bill contains NO provision for punishment of management in case of a violation. Technically, that punishment is alleged to be "the loss of plants by government seizure." However, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Biddle are reported as not wanting any provisions for punishment of employers in the Ramspeck Bill because they feel that they already have sufficient powers under the Selective Service Act.

Ramspeck is reported in the New York Times as admitting that while the measure may be "pretty drastic" it will "prevent strikes in defense industry unless owners want to lose their plants and workers their rights." He assured the press that the bill contains a stipulation assuring that "it in no way infringes upon a worker's right to quit his job, but if he does so he will find himself without the protection which has made collective bargaining possible." And he added, "In effect the measure would strip a union which strikes in violation of the provisions set up under the new law of its standing under present laws, thus preventing it from claiming to represent the employees in the dispute."

It seems that this bill was approved by both the President and a "bi-partisan" group from the House in a conference called by the President at the White House last Tuesday evening. The fourth provision providing for compulsory arbitration was not settled upon at this meeting, but Speaker Rayburn is reported as assured that if this clause is included in the bill, the President will sign it. Rayburn also told the press that "the Administration doesn't want to take the hair off anyone."

The only opposition to the bill so far reported is from Representatives Smith of Virginia and Hoffman of Michigan. They are reported to be opposed to the bill because they fear that "compulsory arbitration involved too great a degree of government control over the conduct of a business and over the private rights of individuals."

It is not clear from this statement just whom Hoffman and Smith fear. But I wouldn't take any bets on it. Hoffman and Smith undoubtedly fear that some of their employer constituents might lose their plants through violation of the bill, and thus lose the lucrative profits accruing from war contracts.

The biggest contradiction in the claim that the Ramspeck Bill provides equal punishment for both labor and capital are embodied in Amendment Five to the Constitution of the United States. No government agency can seize and hold any private property without just compensation. But under the terms of this act, the government will be able to deprive labor of its only

FLASHES from the Courtroom

Highlights in the Minneapolis "Sedition" Trial

Onlookers in the courtroom could not help remarking the striking difference between the defense witnesses, and those who appeared for the prosecution.

The prosecution witnesses, consisting for the most part of Tobin payrollers and stooges, were either sub-normal mentally, or obviously concerned only with the material rewards that would come their way from Tobin, for their perjured testimony against the men who made Minneapolis a union town.

The defense witnesses were physically and mentally the finest type of union men—clean-cut, courageous, intelligent and poised individuals. Witnesses of the type of the two Reiersen boys, Harold Martin, and Dick Atherton could not help but impress the court. The above, all members of the Union Defense Guard, told the court they joined the Guard to defend the union and the union hall against the Silver Shirts and other fascist groups who were lining up with the Associated Industries in 1938 to try to smash Local 544, spearhead of organized labor in this area.

District Attorney Anderson asked defense witness Ole Reiersen: "Who said the Associated Industries didn't like unions?" (1) The Associated Industries says so—in every action it takes against organized labor. The labor-hating profit-mad bosses of the Associated Industries like unions all right, all right. The kind of unions they like are unions with no dues, no contracts and damned few members.

Defense witness Harold Martin, 544 job steward, told the court there were never over 150 men at Union Defense Guard meetings. In 1939, he testified, after the Silver Shirts disappeared.

Dick Atherton, former 544 steward, economic weapon—the right to strike.

And that right was not given to labor by legislation. It was won over a period of one hundred years by a constant and never ending struggle. Hundreds of workers have fed their blood into that fight. More hundreds have gone down in death. Many others have spent years in jail because of their unalterable belief in the working class's right to exert its power.

DON'T LET THE RAMSPECK BILL OR ANY OTHER BILL ROB YOU OF THAT RIGHT! INSIST THAT YOUR UNION AWAKEN TO THE DANGER WHICH THIS BILL EMBODIES. DON'T REST UNTIL YOU HAVE DONE YOUR PART TO SEND THIS BILL DOWN TO DEFEAT. YOU HAVE ONLY ONE WEAPON WITH WHICH TO FIGHT AND THAT IS THE RIGHT TO STRIKE. DON'T LET ANYONE OR ANYTHING ROB YOU OF THAT RIGHT!

ard, drew a hearty laugh from the court when, after the court asked him if he knew all the defendants, he began scanning faces of the newspaper reporters seated next to the defendants, under the impression the newsmen were among the indicted.

Dick cooly explained he had never been in a courtroom before. Anderson got nowhere fast when he sought to shake the testimony of Gustave Reiersen, former captain in the Union Defense Guard.

V. R. Dunne briefly sketched the story of his colorful life for the jury. In 1932 he was fired from a fuel company owned by the Ford Motor company—fired for speaking against Adolf Hitler at mass meetings in Minneapolis.

At one point during Dunne's testimony, when the witness began to describe Tobin's dictatorial attitude toward the 544 membership, Mr. Schweinhaut protested "The feud with the AFL has nothing to do with this case." Not much it hasn't! Only that Dictator Tobin ran crying to Roosevelt after the 544 membership voted to join the CIO—and that Roosevelt immediately advised "all interested governmental agencies" of Tobin's predicament, the indictments against the leaders of 544-CIO following shortly thereafter.

(Continued from page 1) the miners felt it necessary to submit their case to arbitration. Slanders '34 Strikes

Another outrageous instance of the prosecution's anti-labor bias came when Anderson was cross-examining V. R. Dunne, defendant and Local 544-CIO organizer. Anderson charged Dunne and other defendants with inciting the striking truckdrivers to commit violence in the 1934 strikes. Anderson dragged out the old story about the death of Arthur Lyman, special deputy in the May, 1934 drivers' strike, seeking to convey to the jury the idea that Ray Dunne was responsible.

Earlier Schweinhaut, in questioning James P. Cannon, defendant and National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party,

Commissary Still Needs Food

The Commissary Committee asks that friends and sympathizers of the defendants to remember that, even though the trial is almost over, the commissary itself will have to continue feeding many people for some time. Many of the defendants' families are eating there, and no matter what the outcome of the trial may be, these children still have to eat. If you care to contribute, the committee says that they need potatoes, meat, all staples, fruit, etc.

Defendant Dunne repudiated all the slander of the Tobin agents. We are more than willing to let the workers of Minneapolis—who for years have known Vincent Dunne and also have known the Tobin agents—decide on which side the truth is.

From Anderson's cross-examination of Dunne, one gathered that the District Attorney believes it subversive to advocate and support the idea that labor should have a political party of its own, separate from and opposed to the old boss-ridden Republican and Democratic machines.

Observers in the courtroom Monday included an interested minister, and the family of V. R. Dunne. The most interested spectators at the Friday sessions were the three daughters of defendant Farrell Dobbs; they never took their eyes off their father.

Monday evening defendants eating at the commissary enjoyed the last of the Thanksgiving turkeys.

George Frosg, Roy Orgon and Ray Rainbolt followed Vincent Dunne on the witness stand.

The Indian, Rainbolt, drew many a chuckle as he testified in his salty style.

Remaining defense witnesses were the defendants Miles Dunne,

Grace Carlson and Farrell Dobbs.

After reading his lucid article from the March 29, 1941, issue of the Militant, in which it is specifically explained that the Socialist Workers Party will attempt to institute a socialist society only after it has won the support of the majority of the American people to its program, Defense Attorney Albert Goldman dramatically announced: "The defense rests its case."

The sudden ending to the testimony seemed to take the prosecution counsel by surprise. The defense rested at noon Tuesday. Jurors and defendants were then excused for the balance of the day.

District Attorney Victor Anderson described his closing address to the jury as an "appeal to reason." Instead, the address was an appeal to the basest prejudices. The talk abounded in such words and phrases as Stars and Stripes—Uncle Sam—in the name of Heaven—Why not go to Russia?—Eternal Judgment Day—the Master Head at Coyoacan—Pawns in their hands—an American—sabotage—Old Glory—the good of the order—the life to come, etc., etc.

"The Socialist Workers Party is what we want to stop, before it sees the light of another day," Anderson thundered at the jury. "We

want to exterminate this party so that it won't threaten for another century."

In revolting praise of the Tobin stool pigeon, Bartlett, Anderson told the jury that "Mr. Bartlett's stature grows until he towers to the ceiling and beyond." It is certainly true that if Bartlett could stand on a pile of his tall lies, he would reach to considerable heights.

At one point in his address, Anderson implied that unions no longer have the right to strike. Defense Attorney Goldman immediately challenged him, and the court upheld the defense.

"Why should Bartlett want to fabricate?" Anderson asked the jury, as though that question were a stumper.

Bartlett lied because he hates the incorruptible leaders of 544-CIO—because Tobin pays him to lie—because Bartlett is ambitious to get on in the world, and doesn't mind climbing on the bodies of the best union men in Minneapolis.

Word got around Minneapolis that when Defense Attorney made his closing speech, the courtroom would hear the finest orator in the nation. Thursday the court was packed to the corners, with many disappointed persons standing in the halls listening for the sound of Goldman's voice. Several lawyers came to hear Goldman's masterly plea.

Prosecution Shows Anti-Labor Bias

charged the party had incited the Minneapolis workers to commit violence in the 1934 strikes. Minneapolis trade unionists in the courtroom audience, including some veterans of the '34 strikes—grinned their appreciative agreement with Cannon when he answered Schweinhaut:

"The special deputies in 1934 were sent to drive the workers off the streets. They got a dose of their own medicine. I think the workers have a right to defend themselves. I'm mighty proud that Trotskyists had a part in leading the workers in defense of their rights. If that is treason, you can make the most of it."

Anderson Goes the Limit

In his closing argument District

Attorney Anderson went the whole hog, trying to arouse in the jurors not only anti-labor prejudices against the defendants, but also religious prejudices. Anderson told the jury in a shocked whisper that the defendants held meetings "on the Sabbath." Unable to claim that he had proved a case beyond a reasonable doubt, Anderson resorted to urging the jurors to find a verdict with the same kind of simple faith in the government case that the disciple Paul had in Christ. "Believe, believe!" he shouted at the jurors.

What Anderson didn't tell the jury is that Christ and Paul and the early Christians were persecuted by just such intolerant and hide-bound reactionaries as Anderson, and that the defendants, preach-

ing the rights of labor, are in the same situation in facing a reactionary government as was St. Paul when he was placed in chains.

Just as the Pharisees demanded the persecution of Christ because "he stirreth up the people," so Anderson demanded the jailing of the labor defendants because they will not conform to Anderson's idea of "law and order."

Perhaps the lowest point reached by Anderson was when he said that Ed Palmquist, for his organizing WPA workers, really "should have been accused of treason," rather than just "sedition conspiracy." To Anderson it is treason to organize workers!

YOU Can Help The Defendants

The twenty-eight men and women who are on trial in the federal courtroom in Minneapolis are front-line fighters in the cause of union rights and civil liberties of this nation.

They merit the whole-hearted and generous moral and material support of every progressive organization and individual genuinely concerned with maintaining our democratic and constitutional rights.

Their fight against the prosecution must be won. That is why the CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE has been organized. Chairman of the Committee is James T. Farrell. Vice chairman is John Dos Passos. Secretary is George Novack. Scores of outstanding laborites, educators, civil liberty defenders, liberals have joined the national board of the CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE.

The government prosecution has been denounced by the CIO, Labor's Non-Partisan League, the United Auto Workers, the American Civil Liberties Union, THE NATION, THE NEW REPUBLIC, etc.

The CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE needs \$7,500 immediately to defray the heavy costs of fighting this case. Aid the 28 defendants by contributing promptly and generously to their Defense Fund. Mail all donations to the

Civil Rights Defense Committee

c-o Industrial Organizer, 1328 Second St. N.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

A receipt will be mailed you from the Industrial Organizer and from the national office of the Civil Rights Defense Committee.

LEARN THE TRUTH!

READ!

Witch Hunt in Minnesota

By George Novack
Secretary of the Civil Rights Defense Committee
24 pages - 5c

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MINNEAPOLIS SEDITION TRIAL

Opening statement for the defense
by Albert Goldman
16 pages - 5 for 5c

Order these pamphlets from Local 544-CIO headquarters, 9th Street and 12th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.